

Meeting Report

CALIFORNIA INDIAN CULTURAL CENTER AND MUSEUM TASK FORCE
Thursday, July 1st, 2004

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE
(CALIFORNIA INDIAN HERITAGE CENTER)

**Resources Building, Room 940, Sequoia Room
1416 9th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814**

Task Force Members and/or Designees present: Gen Denton, Walter Gray, Cindy La Marr, and Larry Myers

DPR Staff present: Leo Carpenter, Jr., Cuauhtemoc Gonzalez, Pauline Grenbeaux, and Paulette Hennum

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair of Subcommittee Walter Gray called the meeting to order at 9:20 am. Gray reviewed the names of the members of the Subcommittee and decided to move forward without the State Librarian's designee, previously Charlene Simmons.

REVIEW AGENDA

Gray reviewed the agenda.

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE

Gray briefly summarizes what happened at the last meeting on February 18, 2004. He regretted that he had to cancel the last meeting date. He noted that he has had long conversations with State Parks Director Ruth Coleman about the governance and organizational structure of the California Indian Heritage Center (CIHC). He felt that Director Coleman was particularly impressed with the "Remarkable Women" exhibit at the California State History Museum and how it exposed State Parks to a new governance nonprofit structure. There is a way that is mapped out that can work. Indian people will be able to have control and State Parks will be able to handle what it does best.

Recap: went over a number of coop relationships. Where does this project fit in. feels that the organizational stucure needs to fulfil certain things....1. Makes use California Indians are in control of what is important to them.2. Ensure public funds and collections is not precluded by the organizational structure. There is often a lack of consciousness s of the needs of California Indian people.3. Something needs to happen to build trust and accountability between the two. 4. Needs to fulfill the reqs of the vision statement.

Two alternative approaches...

Typical private nonprofit governance... most museums are run in the manner. There are a range of organizational models within this. Been in conversation with Ruth to make sure that she will be in support of the organizational structure and will stand behind it. She has become fond of what is used by the secretary of state at the California state history museum. Believe that Ruth would be supportive of parks being involved but does not run it. High level of collaboration...

His belief is that composite organization would not work. Govt will want to take over. Looked at the CA science center and CA African American museum... distinctive organizational structure. Top four officials get paid by the non profit and the state. There is a problem of duty and responsibility... who do you work for when there is a conflict between the two? Directors of the museums have to account for their time... billable hours. But it is still not evident what happens when there is a conflict. CA state history museum was set up to run in this way but it was changed because of the conflict. Was not difficult to change.

Worries about if it is not in the resources code that it could fail in the future because it does not have the necessary legal/governmental support. Needs to go into state statute, but even then that guarantees this project to be safe. Consider a piece of legislation to guarantee the relationship with DPR.

Kept coming back to the vision statement to come up with a structure...

Govt- process, rules, stable, structure, lack of flexibility, slow burdensome, awkward,

Non-profit side- product/outcome, results, less stable, more flexible,

Biggest difference is that govt process is closed and non-profit is open. But for non-profit tax exempt status it has to run for public benefit/interest even though govt claims to operate in this way it is very closed. Non-profit can involve many more people.

Denton- who make the rules for the non-profit?

It does but it still has to abide by some rules.

La Marr- has to have bylaws when they incorporate.

Myers- Jewish museum gets state money even though it's private... but it is with restrictions.

Don't get state money for operations... capital outlay development.

Have to scramble on operations side to get donations.

What do cultural inst. Do?

Gonna have the same structure as the same institutions.

Facilities- buildings, infrastructure, grounds, maintenance

Exhibits- displays, structure

Collections- objects, documents, images, records, "stuff"

Programming- interpretation, education, social, spiritual, events, outreach, publicity, research

Policies- what guides what is visible. Facilities, exhibits, collections >+ policies = programs...

Indian people have to be involved in Policy and in Collections... important but not crucial in exhibits and in the same in facilities.

The non-profit is what is going to have to hire the Indians.

Now that we have a feel where can we go with it.

DPR is the logical collaborator... have not done a great job but it is the only one that has done the job. Thinks that DPR will become the default for museums and the arts also after the performance review.

Parks can keep the roof on the building.

Relationship is not balanced where the nonprofit will have a lot of influence... govt will have some influence in areas but just to make sure its interests are taken care of.

In favor of a self perpetuating board... may have ex-officio members. At state museum they have a non specific number of a board. Statute says that they can have up to 30 but they are operating at about 18 now.

Can build the board to accomplish the goals... often they need high caliber people to get started and as they mature they start to change to become policy and fund raising orgs. Will evolve over time. Govt will evolve slow and in mostly in events of crisis.

Myers thinks that the NAHC should also be involved in the organizational structure also.

NAHC might bring some credibility... and help out DPR with that. Need to create a structure that can promote and build trust. Don't assume that trust exists.

Line item on the state budget. There is an option to have a special fund. There may be other sources of revenue that could go to the future operation of the facility. Have right to use certain funds.

Volitional obligation-

Now have been focusing on the details. How are they on the concept of it all. There is something in the state law that seems like it would work for the CIHC. It can be done. This is not the first time that it has been attempted.

Carpenter- thinks there is an opening for regional representation for ca Indian people from 12 regions in CA to serve on the board. It will be fair to all Indians north and south. A man and a woman could serve from each of the regions

La marr- it may be become cumbersome. And how could these people have the expertise? There could be councils that advise the board.

Carpenter- important to have representation. It will be fair and balanced.

Gray- if the concept has merit it can be implemented through an evolution. Original board could be a reconstitution of the Task Force and then... 2. add members as they become available... who has the resources, time... 3. revise and finalize bylaws and adopt the final mature form. Becomes what it needs to become.

How would advisory councils fit in?

On Board...

Legal minimum requirement... Minimum size is 3 officers...
legal minimum obligations is two... fiduciary and policy control.

Myers- Going to have to have a constant dialogue and the nonprofit will have to bring in the community concerns.

Gray- diagram is just to convey an idea.

But every one is involved in everything but for the most part people will stay where they know. There should be some things that the state should not have some involvement in. They can know is what is going on but that's about it.

Gray- will come back with some specific documents to go over. To better map out how this organizational structure will work.

Myers- would like to see what kinds of advisory groups needs to be formed for the CIHC.

Gray- to send material by mid july and hope for comments from the other members and the work on it more then to get it back to them... then eventually present it to the full task force. Narrative statement that fits the visions statement... proposed organizational structure to accomplish these goals. TF members shouls also feel free to give wait other materials. Also a bare bones articles incorporation and by laws and a model bill.

Myers- bill to include spriritual gatherings.

Gray- depends on the politics of the moment.

Set a date...

Circulate dates at a later time

Myers- not available from 23rd july through first week of August. July 19th may be a good date. Gray to have material out to tf by july 16th.

Adjourn: 11:55 am